

REMARKS

The Office Action indicates claims 1-11 are pending and under consideration. By this amendment, claims 1, 3, 6, 9, and 10, and the specification are amended. The amendments are made to even more clearly recite the claimed invention and do not add new matter and are fully supported by the specification. Reconsideration of the rejected claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claim 1 would be allowable if Applicants' response overcomes the Examiner's rejections.

Objections to the Specification

The Office Action objects to the specification, alleging improper use of trademarks in the claims. Without acquiescing to or agreeing with the objection, Applicants note that the specification has been amended to include the generic terminology associated with each of the trademarks. Applicants respectfully request that the objections be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

The Action objects to claims 1 and 9 because of the terminology "reverse phased." The Examiner notes that the term "reverse phased" is a typographical error,

and should be “reversed phase.” Applicants have amended the claims to correct this error. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Office Action rejects claims 1-11, alleging that the claims are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter.

The Action rejects claim 1, alleging it is unclear as to the substance being purified and the antecedent basis of “primary purification step” and “secondary pre-purification step.” Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner regarding definiteness of the claim. However, without acquiescing to or agreeing with the rejection, Applicants note that the claim has been amended for further clarification. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

The Action rejects claims 3, 6, and 10, alleging improper use of trademarks in the claims. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner regarding definiteness of the claim. Without acquiescing to or agreeing with the rejection, Applicants note that the claims have been amended to recite the generic terminology associated with each of the trademarks. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all of the claims are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number

listed below, if needed. Please charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0089.

Respectfully submitted,
KANG et al.

Stan Myers-Payne
Bruce Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027 42,920

October 23, 2006
Greenblum & Bernstein, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, Virginia 20191
Telephone: 703-716-1191
Facsimile: 703-716-1180